

In re Application of: Shlomo SHKOLNIK  
Serial No.: 09/914,487  
Filed: August 27, 2001  
Final Office Action Mailing Date: December 20, 2007

Examiner: Jason Scott PROCTOR  
Group Art Unit: 2123  
Attorney Docket: 36538

### **REMARKS**

The present Application includes claims 23-26, 30, 31, 41, 42, 51, 72-76 and 80-92. Claims 23, 82, 86, 88 and 91 are currently amended. Claims 32-40, 43, 53-71 and 77 are cancelled herewith subject to submission in a continuation application. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

The present amendment is made to place the application in better condition for appeal, notice of which has already been applied for.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous interview granted to Applicant's representative Dr. Paul Fenster. During this interview the previous (unentered) after final submission and the advisory action were discussed to determine whether the claims other than 32 and 77 (and the claims dependent on them) could be amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112. There was agreement that the previous amendments, with some additional changes, reflected in the above, would overcome the rejections under §112. The claims have been amended to overcome all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 except for the following, which are respectfully traversed. Applicant understands that the Examiner agrees that the arguments overcome the rejection, however, they are repeated for completeness of the record.

The rejection of claim 23 (second item) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. The Examiner indicates that it is not clear which information is referred to on line 10. Line 10 reads:

“storing the *gathered* information in the index; and.” (Emphasis added.)

Applicant notes that lines 6 and 7 read in part:

“gathering, by a computer, from the plurality of computerized design tools, information on elements of different systems of the vehicle.” Applicant submits that the term “gathered information” referred clearly and unambiguously to the information that is indicated as being gathered in the paragraph beginning line 6.

Applicant notes that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is withdrawn. However, applicant can not agree with the interpretation given to the claim by the Examiner. In particular, while quoting parent claim 82 correctly, the Examiner has ignored the limitation:


In re Application of: Shlomo SHKOLNIK  
Serial No.: 09/914,487  
Filed: August 27, 2001  
Final Office Action Mailing Date: December 20, 2007

Examiner: Jason Scott PROCTOR  
Group Art Unit: 2123  
Attorney Docket: 36538

“generating a database *including information on the relationship between elements of the vehicle from the various systems.*” (Emphasis added.) Clearly the database does include certain information and an empty database does not meet this limitation.

Applicant understands that these amendments and explanations will result in the withdrawal of all the rejections under §112, so that the application is in order for filing of an appeal brief. An advisory action to this effect is respectfully awaited.

Respectfully submitted,

 11,016

Paul Fenster,  
Reg. No. 33,877

Date: June 18, 2008